



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/524,250	10/06/2005	May Griffith	D-4115	4662
33197	7590	03/13/2009		
STOUT, UXA, BUYAN & MULLINS LLP				
4 VENTURE, SUITE 300				
IRVINE, CA 92618				
EXAMINER				
SILVERMAN, ERIC E				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1618				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
03/13/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/524,250

Applicant(s)

GRIFFITH ET AL.

Examiner

ERIC E. SILVERMAN

Art Unit

1618

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-50 and 109-117 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 1-50, 109-117 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/CDC)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: ____
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-20 and 109-117 are currently pending in the instant application.

Priority

This application is a 371 of PCT/CA03/01180, filed 8/11/2003.

Acknowledgement is made of Applicant's claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d), by Canadian patent application 2397979 filed on 8/9/2002.

Election/Restrictions

Restriction is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 and 372.

Lack of Unity Requirement

Claims 1-117 are drawn to more than one inventive concept (as defined by PCT Rule 13), and accordingly, a restriction is required according to the provision of PCT Rule 13.2.

PCT Rule 13.2 states that the international application shall relate to one invention only or to a group of inventions so linked as to form a single general inventive concept (requirement of unity of invention).

PCT Rule 13.2 states unity of invention referred to in Rule 13.1 shall be fulfilled only when there is a technical relationship among those inventions involving one or more of the same or corresponding special technical features.

Annex B, Part 1 (b), provides that "special technical features" mean those technical features, which, as a whole, define a contribution over the prior art.

Annex B, Part 1 (e), provides combinations of different categories of claims and states:

"The method for determining unity of invention under Rule 13 shall be construed as permitting, in particular, the inclusion of any one of the following combinations of claims of different categories in the same international application:

(i) in addition to an independent claim for a given product, an independent claims for a process specially adapted for the manufacture of the said product, and an independent claim for use of the said product, or

(ii) in addition to an independent claim for a given process, an independent claim for an apparatus or means specially designed for carrying out the said process, or

(iii) in addition to an independent claim for a given product, and independent claim for a process specially adapted for the manufacture of the said product, and an independent claim for an apparatus or means specially designed for carrying out the said process,..."

This application contains the following inventions or groups of inventions, which are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

In accordance with 37 CFR 1.499, applicant is required, in response to this action, to elect a single invention to which the claims must be restricted.

Group I: Claims 1-12 and 49, drawn to a synthetic copolymer.

Group II: Claims 13-20 and 50, drawn to a bio-synthetic matrix.

Group III: Claims 21-24, drawn to a method for regenerating tissue

Group IV: Claim 25, drawn to a method for coating surgical implants

Group V: Claims 26 and 112-117, drawn to composition comprising active agents, copolymer, biopolymer, and aqueous solvent

Group VI: Claims 27-33, drawn to a composition comprising cells, a copolymer, a biopolymer, and an aqueous solvent

Group VII: Claims 34-42, drawn to an implant

Group VIII: Claim 43 drawn to a process for preparing a synthetic copolymer

Group IX: Claims 44-48, drawn to a process for preparing a bio-synthetic matrix

The inventions listed as Groups I-IX do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, they lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons: they do not share the same structural element(s) that define the "special technical feature" necessary to specify a contribution over the prior art.

The structural moiety, element, or step common to **Groups I-IX** is a copolymer comprising one or more N-alkyl or N,N-dialkyl substituted acrylamide comonomers, one or more hydrophilic comonomers, and one or more acryl- or methacryl carboxylic acid co-monomers, which is known in the art. See US 4614701 at Example 1, disclosing a copolymer of dimethylaminopropyl methacrylamide (a N-alkyl or N,N-dialkyl substituted acrylamide), 2-hydroxyethyl methacrylate (a acryl- or methacryl- carboxylic acid monomer), and methacrylamide (a hydrophilic monomer). Therefore, this cannot be said to be the special technical feature that makes a contribution over the prior art. All other structural moieties, elements, or steps differ materially from one another. Thus, these claims lack the corresponding special technical feature(s) necessary to link them together to fulfill the Unity of Invention requirement.

In accordance with 37 CFR 1.499, applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single invention to which the claims must be restricted.

In addition, applicant is further required to elect a single species for each of genus,

as outlined below. A species must be elected for each genus irrespective of which Group is elected.

Applicants must elect a single species of synthetic copolymer. The elected species must specify each and every monomer in the copolymer. The monomers must be elected specifically, with no unspecified or alternative groups. Applicants must also elect the disposition of the monomers relative to one another (random copolymer, block copolymer, graft copolymer, etc).

Because this requirement is complex, a telephonic response was not solicited.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143). A complete response will also include an election of species consonant with the requirement set forth herein, and a listing of claims readable on the elected species. Applicant is reminded that should any new claim(s) be added at a later time, Applicant is obliged to determine whether or not the newly added claim(s) read on the elected species and to make a statement to this effect at the time that the claim(s) are added.

The examiner has required restriction between combination and subcombination inventions. Where applicant elects a subcombination, and claims thereto are subsequently found allowable, any claim(s) depending from or otherwise requiring all the limitations of the allowable subcombination will be examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. See MPEP § 821.04(a). Applicant is advised that if any claim presented in a continuation or divisional application is anticipated by, or includes all the limitations of, a claim that is allowable in the present application, such claim may be subject to provisional statutory and/or nonstatutory double patenting rejections over the claims of the instant application.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims.

Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and the product claims are subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be considered for rejoinder.

Art Unit: 1618

All claims directed to a nonelected process invention must require all the limitations of an allowable product claim for that process invention to be rejoined.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103 and 112. Until all claims to the elected product are found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowable product claim will not be rejoined. See MPEP § 821.04(b). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution to require the limitations of the product claims. **Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder.** Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ERIC E. SILVERMAN whose telephone number is (571)272-5549. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Thursday 7:00 am to 5:00 pm and Friday 7:00 am to noon.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Hartley can be reached on 571 272 0616. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Eric E Silverman/
Examiner, Art Unit 1618